

## ***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***

***June 15 - 16, 2005***

***Miner's Inn***

***Yreka, California***

### **FINAL MINUTES**

#### **Membership:**

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Glen Spain (alternate)
California Department of Fish and Game	Neil Manji
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Vacant
Del Norte County	Chuck Blackburn
Hoopa Valley Tribe	Mike Orcutt
Humboldt County	Not represented
Karuk Tribe	Ron Reed
Klamath County	Not represented
Klamath Tribe	Garrick Jackson (alternate)
National Marine Fisheries Association (NOAA Fisheries)	Irma Lagomarsino
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Keith Wilkinson
Siskiyou County	Marcia Armstrong
Trinity County	Not represented
US Department of Agriculture	Peg Boland
US Department of Interior	John Engbring, Chair
Yurok Tribe	Dave Hillemeier

#### **June 15, 2005**

##### **1. Convene and opening remarks**

John Engbring welcomed everyone to the meeting. Irma Lagomarsino is the Vice Chair. Neil Manji won't be voting today because Task Force staff has not received an official appointment from the Governor of California for the CDFG seat on the Task Force. John Engbring mentioned Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) staff changes. Gary Curtis will be taking over Laurie Simons' responsibilities. John Engbring thanked Laurie Simons for her excellent work and commitment to the Task Force.

##### **2. Remembrance of Ronnie Pierce**

The group recalled many memories of Ronnie Pierce. Dave Hillemeier discussed the memorial service that was held at the Yurok Tribal Headquarters in April 11, 2005. Ronnie was very influential in the Klamath Basin and had many successes on the Task Force and in other efforts. She was a champion of the Basin.

##### **3. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance**

No congressional staff in attendance

##### **4. Business**

###### **a. Approval of minutes**

**Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the February meeting minutes.**

**Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**b. Adoption of agenda**

Agendum items 6a and 6b were moved to agendum items 14b and 14c because they are closely related. An update on the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process was added to agendum item 11. The group will try to fit agendum 21 into Thursday morning's agenda in order to have enough time to make a decision on the 2006 work plan. The group will also discuss coordination between the Klamath Technical Working Group (TWG) and Trinity Management Council under agendum item 9. The group agreed to add time to briefly discuss the disaster relief request under agendum 18, as well as time to discuss recent litigation challenging fishery management for natural Klamath River fall Chinook.

**Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda as amended.**

**Seconded by Glen Spain.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

John Engbring recognized former Task Force member Steve West as an energetic entity on the Task Force. John Engbring appreciates his energy and focus directed toward solving problems, Steve West was awarded with a certificate of appreciation.

**5. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Gary Curtis)**

Gary Curtis reviewed the motions and assignments from the February meeting. The Request for Proposals (RFP) went out as called for by the Task Force in February. Petey Brucker will report on the status of this process in more detail under the TWG update. Gary Curtis also reviewed the list of handouts.

**6. Brief Updates and Announcements****a. Update on State coho recovery process (Neil Manji)**

Discussion took place under agendum 14.

**b. Update on Shasta-Scott Recovery Team (Neil Manji)**

Discussion took place under agendum 14.

**c. Update on NOAA coho recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino)**

Irma Lagomarsino said there has been more progress on coho recovery planning. The Southern Oregon Northern California Coho (SONCC) Technical Recovery Team (TRT) melded into a larger recovery team a few years ago. There is a draft population identification analysis being prepared by that team that will be reviewed by co-managers. There could be a public document on that analysis available by September. The analysis looks at historical population boundaries within the SONCC coho Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) and breaks down smaller populations of the listed entity. There may be a meeting in October where the draft population viability criteria could be discussed. After the population identification step and the development of viability criteria, the TRT will launch into phase two of recovery planning, which could consist of a team or workshops to develop a plan that contains measures that will help achieve recovery.

**d. Update on NOAA hatchery listing policy (Irma Lagomarsino)**

Irma Lagomarsino reported that the final hatchery listing policy and final status determinations should be published any day now. One year ago, the proposed status reviews were published. Chuck Blackburn asked about the lawsuits that held up this process. Irma Lagomarsino responded that the Alsea Valley Alliance litigation dealt with how to take hatchery fish into consideration with threatened and endangered species.

**e. Government Accountability Office audit of Restoration Program**

John Engbring said the restoration program was audited by the Government Accountability Office (GAO). GAO staff have visited the Yreka FWS office and gone through files and budget records, and are working on their report. They expect the report to be out at the end of July or early August. John Engbring said it is not unusual to have audits of programs or offices. Glen Spain asked if Task Force members could review the report during the 30-day agency review period. John Engbring asked Staff to determine if a review period is given and if the Task Force members can be involved.

**Assignment: Staff will determine if Task Force members can review the report from the Government Accountability Office during the review period given to FWS.**

**7. Discussion of the letter from Sue Ellen Wooldridge regarding additional funding for future monitoring of fisheries in the Klamath Basin (John Engbring)**

John Engbring reported that Sue Ellen Wooldridge has continued to stay involved with Klamath Basin issues. He said her response letter seems to be non-committal, but the Department of Interior could not ensure the necessary amounts of funding would be provided by congress in the future. Sue Ellen Wooldridge indicates her understanding of the need for monitoring, but the letter doesn't give specifics regarding amounts of funding.

The group discussed future funding to fill the monitoring gaps when the Klamath Act sunsets. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) does not have appropriated money specifically for monitoring. The loss to the salmon management process without the Task Force is substantial – about \$150,000 per year. Irma Lagomarsino reported that the Department of Commerce can't lobby congress, and has been provided for monitoring spawning runs. What they rely on stakeholders to lobby their congressmen to fill gaps like this.

A number of Task Force members agreed on the importance of the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) to west coast fishery management and the importance of the salmon ocean harvest model developed by the KFMC through its Technical Advisory Team (TAT).

**8. Discussion of drafting a letter to the Administration regarding the future of the Task Force (John Engbring)**

John Engbring opened the agenda item up for discussion. Chuck Blackburn stated that he wouldn't be participating in this process today if he felt like the Task Force didn't have some real worth. Relationships have been built and he believes the end result is that this group has done a lot of good. He supports drafting a letter to the Administration.

Glen Spain questioned if it is only the funding that sunsets and not the authorization of the Task Force itself. If so, yearly appropriations could be sought. Group members need to work with congressional members, county representatives, and the public to continue the funding.

Marcia Armstrong said she has some concerns about the Task Force. The amount of money over the years has gravitated toward the megatable processes because of the lack of agency funding. There used to be more partnerships with the resource users to address their needs to make habitat improvements and reduce impacts on the fishery. Over the years, there seem to be fewer and fewer emphasis on the partnerships. Marcia Armstrong said that Siskiyou County is being hammered right now, and that efforts that were previously voluntary are now being mandated. There isn't representation from the timber industry and farming industry on the Task Force. She would like to see a different council composition with more partners involved if the group moves forward.

John Engbring asked if the Task Force would like to draft a letter describing accomplishments. He thinks the accomplishments report Staff is working on might be appropriate. Task Force members can use this as a tool however they see fit. Many group members agreed with the idea of using the accomplishments report to communicate the importance of the Task Force. Some group members thought there needs to be a bigger push to show the importance of the Task Force. This could be outlined in a cover letter that goes along with the accomplishments report.

John Engbring suggested the Task Force wait until the GAO report comes out and discuss this further at the October meeting.

**Assignment: Staff will include time for discussion of the Government Accountability Office report on the October agenda, and discussion on letters regarding the future of Klamath Task Force.**

#### **9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (Neil Manji and Dave Hillemeier)**

No report given.

#### **Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)**

Alice Kilham stated that the Upper Basin Working Group is also struggling from a lack of funding. The Compact Commission has mainly been working on the Chadwick stakeholder workshops. No one is going to get anywhere unless a coalition of farmers, environmentalists, and Tribes is formed. There also cannot be success without the agencies. Consensus in this Basin is a must and these workshops are forming a nucleus of people who are agreeing on certain things. She urged people to come to the workshop on June 30<sup>th</sup> in Chiloquin, Oregon.

John Engbring asked if there is any melding of the Conservation Implementation Plan (CIP) in the Chadwick sessions or in the Upper Basin Working Group. Alice Kilham responded that the Upper Basin Working Group has been working with Christine Karas at the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to organize the people involved. The Chadwick workshops have given feedback as to how people think the CIP should work.

#### **Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)**

No update given.

#### **Trinity Management Council (Mike Orcutt)**

Mike Orcutt reported that there is a Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting next week in Eureka, California dedicated to the prioritization of the 2006 budget. There could be changes in priority due to funding availability on the Trinity side. Present funding includes \$10.6 million for restoration, which is provided through BOR and FWS. An issue discussed at the April meeting was the normal year flow schedule and if a portion of that water should be dedicated to later releases if there are adverse conditions in the Klamath. That water has always been kept separate from the Record of Decision (ROD) flows. At the last meeting there was a motion dealing with whether there was scientific justification to support the flows, if there was justification for fall flows, and if that would come out of the ROD. The motion did not pass. It was decided that if additional water is needed in the fall, it shouldn't come out of the Trinity ROD. Lastly, the TMC discussed the need for more coordination between the Trinity and the Klamath, especially to discuss the need and validity for fall flow releases.

The group discussed how increased Trinity flows might not necessarily help avoid a fish die-off like that in 2002 because the problem on the Klamath was between Iron Gate Dam and the Trinity confluence. John Engbring asked if the Trinity group discussed how they would coordinate with the Klamath side.

Mike Orcutt said no, but discussions should get started right away. Neil Manji discussed some of the things this group would need to deal with, like what types of studies both groups would like to see to help identify some of the unforeseen consequences, and what are the triggers. John Engbring suggested the TWG coordinate with the Trinity group to review some of the issues. The group agreed more direct questions need to be developed to help guide the TWG in this effort.

#### **Update on TMDL Process (David Leland)**

David Leland, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, discussed the status of the Klamath Basin TMDL development. He stated his discussion will focus on results rather than methodology. Reports will be available for formal and informal public comment. The presentation consisted of an overview, updates on the Upper Lost River, Lower Lost River, Salmon River, Scott River, Shasta River, and the Klamath River, and a summary of coordination and outreach.

David Leland stated that the TMDL process is triggered by the 303d listings under the Clean Water Act. The overall process is to reduce current inputs to establish a future condition that meets the water quality standard. He reviewed the status of each river under review. They are making a recommendation to de-list the Upper Lost River for temperature and nutrients. There is also a recommendation for de-listing the Salmon River for nutrients. Preliminary conclusions from the Scott River sediment TMDL analysis showed that sediment delivery from roads is small, landslides are big contributors in some areas, and current sediment delivery exceeds 125% of background. On the Scott River, temperature data has been collected and the channel has been mapped. Preliminary conclusions are showing significant effects from human activity. Stream shading is important for reducing stream temperature. Groundwater accretion is an important factor effecting stream temperature in the alluvial areas of the watersheds. Surface diversions and channel geometry changes also affect stream temperature, but not as much.

David Leland showed the Scott River temperature TMDL and groundwater accretion results in graphical form. Reduced groundwater accretion leads to increased temperature conditions in the valley region. This is an important issue for temperature in the Scott mainstem. Jim DePree (Siskiyou County) asked if they modeled the natural groundwater accretion level. David Leland said there is a need for a groundwater-surface water study to determine that.

There is an intensive data collection effort in the Shasta River and analytical tools are being developed. The Shasta Basin Plan objective for dissolved oxygen (DO) is 7mg/L. There are significant exceedence problems in all of the reaches at some time. Temperatures are exceeding juvenile fish rearing thresholds as designated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The model for the Shasta River is working well and they are modeling a variety of scenarios that are relevant to understanding low dissolved oxygen conditions in the river.

David Leland reviewed information from the Klamath River and Lower Lost River. They are working to develop a unified analysis for both of these systems. Data collection on the Lost River is complete and there is a peer reviewed water quality model that TMDL scenarios can be applied to. Problems in this system are complex because there are a series of river segments alternating with impoundments, drains, and canals. There are limitations due to the absence of data with respect to the boundary conditions of the system. Temperature results show that flow can help with temperature, but it is more difficult to use increased flow to get at the water quality issues. On the Klamath mainstem there has been a lot of data collected. Analytical tools are based on the water quality model developed by PacifiCorp, and the water board is working to extend that to the estuary and additional tributaries.

David discussed coordination and outreach. There are newsletters, websites, informational meetings, meetings with stakeholder groups and technical advisory groups, public comment opportunities, and coordination with other agencies like the State Water Quality Control Board on PacifiCorp's 401

certification process, and CDFG. Neil Manji suggested more web coordination with the Klamath Fish Health Advisory Team (KFHAT) on fact sheets. David Leland agreed this was a good idea.

**Assignment: Staff will distribute the TMDL presentation to Task Force members.**

**Assignment: Staff will include time for an update on the TMDL process on the October agenda.**

### **10. Public Comment**

Steve West, West Consulting Group, said that he appreciates the certificate he received from the Task Force. He noted, for the record, that this is the second Task Force meeting that Klamath County has not had representation and that is a disservice. Steve West said he hopes that the sale of PacifiCorp by Scottish Power helps contribute to the restoration of anadromous fish. In terms of the Task Force future, there are four tribal sovereign nations represented, five counties, and an industry group. Those folks have no restrictions on lobbying so he hopes they find some common ground to lobby. Senator Wyden from Oregon supports the funding of restoration projects, and part of that is the purchase of the Barnes Ranch. A looming cloud is that there will be a new administration in 2008. He concluded with a quote from Nancy Parker from BOR in Denver: "all models are flawed, some are useful."

John Engbring asked if anyone has contacted Klamath County to see if they've submitted a replacement for Steve West.

**Assignment: Staff will contact Klamath County to ask if they plan on appointing a representative to the Task Force.**

### **11. Changes in the 2005 Budget**

There were no changes to the 2005 budget.

### **12. Report from the Technical Work Group (Petey Brucker)**

Petey Brucker reported that the TWG met on June 8 and they have completed most of their assignments. They do not currently have a lot of assignments on deck and are looking for direction from the Task Force.

Petey Brucker said the TWG reviewed and ranked the different proposals submitted for the RFP (see agendum 12 handout). Proposals were requested specifically for: Upper Middle Klamath Sub-basin Coordination, Disease research and monitoring, and report on the Status of the Fisheries and mainstem fishery issues.

Petey Brucker reviewed the TWG recommendations for project priorities. The five sub-basins were funded at \$30,000 each. His understanding was that this funding is somewhat flexible. The TWG worked with the TAT of the KFMC on the harvest monitoring item and recommended five proposals that are at the core of monitoring. Petey Brucker concluded by saying that the TWG thinks that money for the symposium and Chadwick session could be better used for technical studies.

Glen Spain asked about monitoring for fish disease and if that is well funded with triggers in place. Petey Brucker said the TWG hasn't had an assignment to work on disease. He gave an overview of KFHAT formed two years ago. Glen Spain said he is concerned that there is less funding available for monitoring. Neil Manji said there is a lot going on to try to figure out the disease issues. In terms of response, the KFHAT has some things in place. We do have a response plan to go out and document what is occurring but we don't have a response in terms of implementing a specific remedy. Chris Karas, BOR, added that there is a conference call every other Tuesday where folks up and down the river share information and

results about the river. John Engbring said this is in-line with the topic regarding coordination between the Trinity and the Klamath. This might be a possible assignment for the TWG.

Petey Brucker reviewed the draft Accomplishments Report requested by the Task Force (see agendum 12 handout). He is looking for general feedback from the Task Force. Gary Curtis added that they want feedback on the concept of how the report is put together and the level of detail included. The group should also discuss the time frame for completion of the report. Task Force members can give feedback to Petey Brucker or Gary Curtis. Marcia Armstrong said she would like to see a section on the disease issue and how it is an area that needs to be further explored. John Engbring suggested eliminating as much text as possible. Do not include information on the life history of the species, for example. John Engbring asked that Task Force members provide comments to Gary Curtis or Petey Brucker within the next two weeks. He would like to see a draft the Task Force can discuss at the October meeting.

### **13. Report from Budget Committee on proposed 2006 Work Plan**

Phil Detrich reported on the Budget Committee meeting held on June 14, and referenced the agendum 13 handout. The Budget Committee began with the TWG recommendations and noted the direction from the Task Force in February regarding various categories. The most important change recommended by the Committee is that the \$30,000 set-aside for the new Mid-Klamath Watershed Council (PC-01) be used elsewhere. This \$30,000 was applied to additional projects on the list (see agendum 13 handout). In regards to the status report proposals requested, neither proposals submitted met the needs of the Task Force. The Committee discussed this and came to the conclusion that the FWS Yreka office would produce both reports. Phil Detrich also noted that the FWS office had reduced administrative costs by \$10,000, which was put back into projects.

Dave Hillemeier asked if his replacement at the Budget Committee meeting, Dan Gale, was engaged in the meeting when the Budget Committee made the final decision to not fund PC-01. John Engbring recalled that Dan Gale was off the phone before a final decision was made but heard the discussion on PC-01. The group discussed the reasoning behind the Budget Committee not funding PC-01. Keith Wilkinson said there was concern about the representation of this new group, which needed to be resolved before funding was provided.

Ron Reed said that he doesn't understand why there is controversy with PC-01. He spent a lot of time considering the direction from the Task Force and the TWG in writing the proposal for funding an Upper Mid-Klamath Watershed Council. The Task Force had decided the watershed was too big geographically and needed to be divided into two areas. He met with stakeholders in the mid-Klamath to gauge concerns and to identify how to move forward. Ron Reed said he didn't feel it was necessary to participate in the Budget Committee meeting yesterday because theirs was the only proposal for the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin. John Engbring explained that there was concern that parts of the community are not on board with working collaboratively with the Karuk Tribe on a sub-basin council. The Budget Committee struggled with putting money toward an effort that everyone is not on board with.

Many Task Force members voiced their concern, since the idea behind funding an upper mid-Klamath sub-basin was to help initiate coordination and collaboration in that area. Marcia Armstrong said she opposed the proposal because the area is composed of many stakeholders whose ideas didn't seem to be included in the proposal for a watershed plan. She said there is also concern about the litigation between the Karuk Tribe and entities they are trying to bring to the table. The proposal from the Karuk Tribe was to split the money in thirds, which is not the integrated approach she has witnessed in the other valleys.

Ron Reed said that the Karuk Tribe is trying to bring people together in a transparent way under the Endangered Species Act process to address the issues with true collaboration. The desire to not have the Chinook listed is a common theme this group can build off of. Ron Reed stated that the Shasta Resource Conservation District (RCD) was very receptive to creating the Upper Mid-Klamath Watershed Council.

Marcia Armstrong stated that she does not support funding for the Upper Mid-Klamath Watershed Council. Neil Manji referenced page 18 from the February meeting minutes and the motion approved by the Task Force for funding watershed planning in the upper portion of the mainstem. John Engbring urged Task Force members to talk about this during the break this evening, in order to come to a final decision tomorrow.

#### **14. Status of Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District and Siskiyou Resource Conservation District Incidental Take Permits (Neil Manji and Caitlin Bean, CDFG)**

Caitlin Bean provided an overview of the incidental take permits. The permit programs are a direct outgrowth of suggestions that came from the Shasta-Scott Recovery Team. The California Fish and Game Commission directed CDFG staff to work with the agricultural community to implement the permit program. The Shasta and Siskiyou RCDs each submitted incidental take permit applications in March 2005. Applications were deemed complete and at the same time, CDFG started notifying diverters of their legal responsibilities and choices for permitting. CDFG has attended public meetings to discuss permit programs and they have received over 60 letters of intent from individuals wishing to participate in the program once it is established with the understanding that during the interim CDFG will not penalize that water user. The incidental take permits will be issued for 5 years, and the RCDs will administer the program and fulfill mitigation and monitoring responsibilities and facilitate compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). They hope to have the program in place sometime in 2006. There are unknowns regarding CEQA compliance funding and public review.

John Engbring asked how the federal permitting process fits in. Caitlin Bean said they hope the processes will mesh. Irma Lagomarsino said NOAA has been at the table during this process and has educated the RCD about the process. NOAA has also commented on the applications from the RCDs.

Dave Hillemeier asked if the draft incidental take permit applications are available. Caitlin Bean replied that they are available through the RCDs. Dave Hillemeier asked if the Tribes can participate and comment as the process moves along. Caitlin Bean responded that she is not aware of another commenting opportunity, but if the RCD opens it up, the Tribes can comment. Dave Hillemeier asked if there is an opportunity for co-managers to review the Environmental Impact Report prior to public review. Caitlin Bean said a broader review can be offered prior to CEQA, but the RCD has the opportunity prior to that.

#### **6a. Update on State coho recovery process**

Neil Manji reported that the State Coho Recovery Team met in late March and all members attended. Each organization presented the recovery actions they implemented in the past year, and there was opportunity to comment on the implementation time table, which is being revised to go to the Fish and Game Commission at the August meeting. There was also a discussion about forming committees to address outstanding issues such as large woody debris management. The next scheduled meeting is early next spring. In regards to the recovery process, the RFP was circulated for the restoration grant process. Proposals that have identified high priority tasks in high priority watersheds will be weighted with extra points.

#### **6b. Update on Shasta-Scott Recovery Team**

Neil Manji reported that the next Shasta-Scott Recovery Team meeting is scheduled for August 22-23, 2005.

#### **15. Planning for Klamath Project Operations and status of the Conservation Implementation Program (Christine Karas, BOR)**



Christine Karas reported on current water year conditions. The June 1 forecasted water year type changed for the lake and river from dry to below average. She stated that irrigation demand has been down quite a bit, the lake elevation is higher than usual at this time of the year. The long-term forecast for the Upper Klamath Basin is a dryer than normal year and we will remain in a hydrologic drought. Christine Karas gave an update on the water bank. She said that BOR has formed a partnership with the national wildlife refuge and it is working out well. Neil Manji asked if some of the spill over Iron Gate Dam is included as water bank water. Christine Karas responded that BOR schedules the water bank water and then it's released according to that schedule. Therefore the water is not in storage, and if water is spilling the water scheduled can be accounted for in that. The group discussed the purchase of Barnes Ranch. Christine Karas stated that Barnes Ranch is leased as part of the water bank. It is proposed as an expansion of the refuge, so details will have to be given by FWS. John Engbring said it is an expansion of the refuge.

Dave Hillemeier said he assumed pumping did not occur in April and May, so what happens with that compensation? Christine Karas said there was some pumping, but there are different kinds of contracts. Some are a solid guarantee for a certain amount of pumping at a certain rate, while others are optional contracts that pump as directed by BOR. Dave Hillemeier stated that he would like to see numbers on that sometime.

Christine Karas discussed the status of the CIP. There were a series of public meetings where comments were received. The next document, Draft 3, will be available in the next few weeks. BOR will send out an RFP soliciting the help of a consulting firm specializing in organizational structure development. She stated that this will always be a living document and modifications can be made. Marcia Armstrong asked if BOR will appear before the counties and present how the program will be integrated. Christine Karas stated that they have offered to put any proposed action before the county to give them veto power before moving forward. This will be spelled out in the next version of the document.

Christine Karas stated that the CIP funded the Chadwick Sessions because they are important to stakeholders. BOR also supported the completion of the FWS 5-year review of the status of the two endangered suckers, and are working to develop a water quality database designed to share data more readily. She envisions a master list of activities as the CIP evolves. The CIP funded the state portion of the water master program in the Scott and Shasta Basins because of the poor state budget.

#### **16. Public comment**

Petey Brucker, TWG, stated that work currently done in the mid-Klamath tributaries meets a variety of objectives like habitat restoration, fishery trend, and disease information, so we may need to think bigger in order to accomplish a task that meets several objectives. The KFHat has picked up issues on the Trinity, but there really isn't funding for this effort. He asked Christine Karas how much funding the CIP receives. Christine Karas reported that the CIP had \$1 million in funding in 2005, and BOR has requested \$4 million for next year. Petey Brucker stated that if the Task Force does not exist, he envisions entities like the Trinity Management Council acting as a mid-level springboard up to the CIP. He added that the TWG will coordinate with the Trinity Management Council. Christine Karas, BOR, said in regards to the coordination issue, she was invited to a technical meeting and the issue did come up. BOR needs to better coordinate amongst ourselves. There was some nervousness that there has already been good progress on the Trinity and they don't want to lose that momentum.

#### **Recess**

Field Trip – Meet in the parking lot to caravan to a project site in the Shasta Valley with Dave Webb

**June 16, 2005****17. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on study results (Jason Ogawa for Nick Hetrick)**

Jason Ogawa introduced himself and said he works in the FWS field office in Arcata. He presented results from their coho radio telemetry study. The research area was from Iron Gate Dam to the estuary, with a focus on the Iron Gate Dam to the Scott River area. The study design included fish acquisition, transmitter attachment, tracking methods, and data analysis. Ninety six hatchery fish were tagged and there were releases in different areas of the river. He discussed results of fish movement, and stated that 603 detections were recorded by mobile tracking. Fish were seen using edge habitat, undercut banks, boulder matrices, willows and cattails, and mid-channel habitat such as shear zones. Jason Ogawa reported that in summary, little movement was observed prior to increases in flows.

**18. Report from Klamath Fishery Management Council on the status of Klamath fishery regulations (Curt Melcher, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife)**

Curt Melcher introduced himself as the Chair of the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) and gave an overview of the KFMC process. The KFMC serves as an advisory body to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) who advises NOAA on fishery management. The KFMC has a technical team that produces a run reconstruction for ocean fishery impacts and estimates number of fish returning to the river on an annual basis. A model developed by the technical team is used to evaluate potential fishery management options for Klamath River fall chinook.

The Task Force discussed the importance of the KFMC role in monitoring and questioned what would happen with monitoring on the Klamath after the Task Force sunsets. Curt Melcher stated that he has made clear to the PFMC that the Klamath Act would be sunseting and a lot of the monitoring and information historically provided by the KFMC may not continue to be available.

Curt Melcher reported that the 2005 stock projection is very low this year. The spawner escapement level is projected at 42,000 fish and the fishery is managed for 35,000 fish to return to spawn in the wild. In years similar to this, the plan has been to close fishing areas closest to the Klamath River, but this year there are major fishery closures in California and Oregon. The in-river fishing opportunities and the in-river tribal fishery are extremely limited this year with 1,262 fish available for the in-river catch and 8,000 fish available for the tribal catch.

Curt Melcher stated that there was much debate in the 2005 pre-season process, and that was a request to lower the spawner escapement goal. There was a PFMC vote to not deviate from the current Fishery Management Plan on the escapement goal level, but there is ongoing discussion on whether this goal is an accurate number. The PFMC has asked their Salmon Technical Team (STT) to brief them on a technical analysis completed on the 35,000-floor number. The PFMC also wants to update that analysis for Klamath fall Chinook. The STT will provide that analysis and come back with a report to the PFMC in September.

The PFMC has also asked the STT to examine the relationship between chinook production and flow because there is a strong feeling by some PFMC members that large fish numbers cannot be supported without adequate amounts of water. Marcia Armstrong mentioned the Shasta RCD letter to the KFMC (see informational handouts) and how it pointed out the disease issue in the mid-Klamath. She hopes that is taken into account in these studies. Curt Melcher stated that the river model uses actual data and takes into account effects of the river environment. He said it could also be decided that the floor number should be higher than 35,000.

Keith Wilkinson stated that the next KFMC meeting is in October in Klamath Falls. It is critical for the Task Force and the general public to get perspective on how these fisheries are managed.

**Disaster Relief Update:**

Glen Spain discussed recent efforts to declare a fishery failure under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for the 2005 season. If a declaration occurs, it would trigger an immediate program but, in general, those are not sufficient to provide much relief, so the next step is usually to go back to congress for additional appropriations. Neil Manji stated that he has seen similar efforts in terms of dealing with the salmon fishery in-river and in the ocean and it is a very complicated thing. Neil Manji said CDFG is taking a look at it and providing information to their management. Data are available, but the question is how to analyze it and then determine how many fish could have been caught.

The group discussed a handout titled "Klamath Fisheries Restoration Task Force Draft Resolutions" provided by Glen Spain (see agendum 18 handout). The document includes the types of actions that would be taken to respond to emergency situations. Glen Spain led the discussion and stated that an early warning fish health assessment system needs to be put in place. Triggers need to be identified so the agencies can take action in a sufficient time frame when those triggers are hit. He said that the current KFHAT is a start. Glen Spain offered agendum 18 handout as resolution to this issue and asked if the Task Force is ready and willing to take this on.

Neil Manji stated that he is on board with portions of this resolution, but the KFHAT team needs to make a presentation to the Task Force before further action is taken. The KFHAT has a response plan that breaks the river into sections with different entities having responsibilities. This has been an ad hoc effort with no funding. A lot of what Glen Spain's document asks for is in the KFHAT report. The positive thing about this document is that it includes input from a lot of entities at the table, but the bottom line is that there is no funding. Neil Manji suggested more time be put into this resolution and that the Task Force members look at the KFHAT report. He suggested the TWG look at the resolution to determine if it meets the expectation of the Task Force. Glen Spain stated that his concern is that there is no knowledge of this effort by management-type people, which is needed in order to get funding. He also thinks there needs to be a plan in place this year. He recommended a letter be drafted to the Secretary that includes the elements of the resolution. John Engbring supported writing a letter to the Secretary, and suggested the TWG examine the resolution in coordination with the Trinity Management Council.

**Assignment: Glen Spain and Marcia Armstrong will draft a letter to the Secretary regarding the disease issue and planning for emergency situations. They will provide the letter to staff to distribute to Task Force members for review.**

**Assignment: The TWG will work with the Trinity Technical Group to coordinate on fish health issues, and to determine if fall pulse flows on the Trinity are biologically appropriate. The TWG will use the draft resolution as a guiding document. The TWG will report back to the Task Force in October.**

**Lawsuit Update:**

Dave Hillemeier reported on the lawsuit brought against the Department of Commerce by the Pacific Legal Foundation representing a group of salmon fishermen. The lawsuit is about the management objective of Klamath fall Chinook and if only natural fish should be managed, or if hatchery fish should be managed with natural fish.

**19. Public comment**

Jerry Barnes, a member of the KFMC's technical team, clarified that the brood year 2002 produced 3-year-olds for 2005 and the brood year 2001 produced 4-year-olds this year. Management is based on the 4-year-olds. This year, it is not the number of 3-year-olds that have caused the restrictions in the fishery. The 4-year-old numbers are low and causing the restrictions.

Phil Detrich, stated that he is the Department of the Interior representative on the KFMC and he wanted to point out that in the handout packet there are two letters from the Shasta RCD and KFMC regarding harvest. The KFMC response to the RCD letter said they would like to send someone to a Shasta RCD meeting to educate people about the fisheries management process. Both of these sides need to understand each other and the proposal for the KFMC to attend a Shasta RCD meeting is a good start. Phil Detrich said the Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office will do what they can to facilitate this effort.

**20. Reports from Sub-basin Coordinators on the status of sub-basin planning, coordination, and restoration efforts****a. Salmon River Sub-basin (Jim Villeponteaux, Salmon River Restoration Council)**

Jim Villeponteaux reviewed the Salmon River Sub-basin restoration strategy. He discussed the accomplishments of the Fire Safe Council, and the fish barrier assessment on the Salmon River. They have recently proposed the removal of two dams on White's Gulch. He said they have produced a fish identification training video available on DVD. Other activities to date include: working with the Karuk Tribe on juvenile fish trapping, spring Chinook and summer steelhead assessments, and a Salmon River spring Chinook voluntary recovery work group. They also have a watershed education program, a private and public land junk removal effort, and a successful noxious weed removal program. He noted that the Salmon River TMDL report is available on the web. In response to the TMDL, the sub-basin, in partnership with the Klamath National Forest has proposed a project to assess critical habitat and areas that need to be re-vegetated. Jim Villeponteaux brought up concern about the sunseting Task Force and continued funding for the sub-basin. He said he would be willing to write letters regarding the importance of the Task Force

**b. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP)**

Dave Webb, Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP) coordinator for the Shasta Valley, stated that there has been a lot of coordination this year. One project was a study to look at the status of groundwater in the Shasta Basin. This was a Proposition 50 project proposal that required a lot of coordination between entities. Another highly coordinated project is the removal of Araujo Dam. Outcomes from the incidental take permit this process and next steps include: funding from various sources, a complete application submitted to CDFG, the incidental take statement underway with NOAA fisheries, the need for Proposition 50 money for environmental documentation, additional stream gauges put into place, and getting the Shasta Scott Recovery Team up to speed. Other projects underway by the Shasta CRMP include: funding for various projects along Yreka Creek, and the Ecosystem Diagnostics and Treatment modeling project (EDT) to determine where restoration projects on the Shasta River would be most beneficial. There is ongoing work with Siskiyou County on various projects and they are doing a lot of work on the TMDL process. Dave Webb stated that the Shasta River groundwater study is due out in December 2005.

**c. Scott River Sub-basin (Rhonda Muse, SRWC)**

Rhonda Muse reported that about 15 watershed interests are involved in the Scott River Watershed Council (SRWC), and that an outreach coordinator has been hired to help get more stakeholder involvement in the SRWC. She reviewed a summary of accomplishments from 1992-2004 in the following areas: water conservation, water quality and soil erosion reduction, and fisheries and habitat monitoring. She also reviewed the progress on the strategic action plan, which includes immediate actions and short-term actions. The limiting factors analysis has been sent to several people for review to better understand which activities cause the greatest harm to anadromous fish. There are many limiting factors listed in the document but there are four major factors. She mentioned that the SRWC is hosting a Tribal trust workshop at 9:00 at the Scott Valley Grange this Saturday.

**d. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Will Harling, Karuk Tribe)**

Will Harling stated that he is contracted as a sub-basin planner for the mid-Klamath region. He presented efforts pertaining to planning, coordination, and fisheries restoration in the mid-Klamath basin. The sub-basin plan partitions the Mid-Klamath area by geology, land use, and land ownership criteria. The sub-basin is the largest cold-water contributor to the mainstem Klamath, has the largest number of key watersheds, has the warmest temperatures in the mainstem near Happy Camp, and the highest juvenile mortality rates. It is also a transport reach to important tributaries. There have been many negative impacts on Tribes and other entities in the mid-Klamath and the outlook on anadromous fish in the sub-basin is dreary. Implementation to-date has been done by the Karuk Tribe, along with other entities. They are currently compiling a database of the restoration projects completed over the past 10 years. A successful restoration project was the road-decommissioning project east of Ishi Pishi Road. Current fish passage improvement projects in the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin include the Stanshaw Creek water conservation and thermal refugia improvement project. Most of the activities in the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin are volunteer-based. They are looking forward to expanding community programs.

Will Harling provided some background information on the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin planning effort. The sub-basin is geographically located from Seiad Creek upstream to Iron Gate Dam. This is a section of the river that is highly impacted by high water temperatures, poor water quality, fish disease, and poorly regulated diversions. No one group is coordinating community based fisheries restoration in this area. Sub-basin planning tasks include coordinating people in the sub-basin for restoration activities, assisting elementary school teachers with school programs, and working with stakeholders to plan and prioritize proposals for grant programs. The goal is to coordinate these community partners to form a watershed council. Will Harling stated that the groups in this sub-basin need to coordinate so we can catch up to the other watershed councils.

Marcia Armstrong stated that there needs to be a different approach to the coordination effort. There has to be extensive outreach and ownership of the plan by community members in that area. Will Harling stated that the key is to get this group together to develop the content of the plan in order to make it a strong plan. Will Harling stated that he believes that he has the ability to facilitate this process between the landowners and the Karuk Tribe. Marcia Armstrong stated that there are two major landowners that need to be involved in this.

**e. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Dave Hillemeier for Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe)**

Dave Hillemeier gave an update on the Lower Klamath Sub-basin. In the previous year an upslope road inventory in the Hunter watershed was completed, which is the eighth completed watershed inventory. An assessment of the relationship between tributary flows and river flows has been initiated. A riparian-needs assessment was completed in Terwer Creek, as was the road-decommissioning project in the Darby Creek watershed. Two log jams were removed in East Terwer Creek, out-migrant trapping is taking place in several creeks and adult monitoring and coho abundance surveys are being done.

## **21. Task Force Decision on 2006 Work Plan**

John Engbring referred to agenda 12 and 13 handouts and reviewed yesterday's discussion on funding an Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin Watershed Council (PC-01). He said that currently, Marcia Armstrong is not inclined to approve a budget that includes PC-01 and Ron Reed is not inclined to support a budget that does not include PC-01. He opened the table for discussion.

Some members of the Task Force said they supported PC-01 after hearing Will Harling's presentation about the initial coordination efforts in the sub-basin. With Task Force funding, key parties can continue coordinating and start identifying and addressing the issues in the sub-basin. The Task Force has made outreach a priority, but that can't be done without funding. Ron Reed stated that Will Harling is capable of moving forward and coordinating with the community in a positive manner.

Marcia Armstrong reiterated her concerns regarding the formation of the watershed council. She doesn't want to see this effort become an extension of Mid-Klamath Watershed Council. All players need to be at the table developing and owning the plan with the Karuk Tribe acting as the facilitator to ensure the work gets done. Her concern is whether it will succeed. She is disappointed that there wasn't endorsement from essential landowners in the area. She stated that Will Harling seems to have a good start on the coordination process and she would like to revisit progress at the October Task Force meeting. She asked that Will Harling keep her posted on progress so she is comfortable this will succeed.

Ron Reed stated that he doesn't necessarily agree with this concern. Initial communication with community members seemed positive. He is willing to meet with Marcia and discuss partners that should be involved, but he is not willing to go forward in a proactive manner and then potentially run into a roadblock again in October. He views this effort as an opportunity to create a process for recovery that many people can be involved in.

There was a suggestion to fund PC-01 with reporting requirements. Task Force members felt it was not fair to hold this sub-basin to different requirements than the other sub-basins. All sub-basins report to the Task Force once a year.

Will Harling agreed with Marsha Armstrong that the people of the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin should create their own basin plan and have ownership of it. Marcia Armstrong asked that the current scope of work outlined in the proposal be amended to state that the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin will have its own basin plan, and that there will be a report back to the Task Force on the coordination process in October. Will Harling stated that he would be happy to report back to the Task Force, but funding for this project doesn't start until 2006, so he suggested pushing back the report to the Task Force. Marcia Armstrong stated that she would be willing to support the formation of the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin and she would like to see the people in that community take ownership of the basin plan.

### **Motion by Keith Wilkinson to pass the 2006 fiscal year budget as follows:**

- **Category 1: 5 Existing sub-basins and PC-01 @ \$30,000;**
- **Category 2: FP-03, FP-02, FP-06, FP-10, FP-04, FP-09 and FP-08 @ \$13,780, and all projects under TAT/TWG Monitoring;**
- **Category 3: Status reports by Yreka FWS office;**
- **\$25,000 from the symposium and Chadwick Consensus meeting are to be applied to FP-09 and FP-08.**

**Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.**

**Discussion of motion:**

Mike Orcutt voiced concern about the Yreka FWS office completing FP-12 and FP-13. Keith Wilkinson stated that the Budget Committee had similar reservations, but the RFP submitted did not meet the needs of the Task Force assignment. Irma Lagomarsino voiced concern about the status reports to be completed by FWS because there is no proposal from the FWS and no way for the Task Force to know how that money will be spent. Phil Detrich replied that if the money is set aside, the Yreka FWS office will get the reports done by hiring a term employee or coordinating with other agencies.

Marcia Armstrong voiced concern about the coho study proposals not being funded. She referenced page 8 of the February minutes and said she thought that was the original intent of the Task Force. Petey Brucker replied that the adult coho surveys were scheduled for 2007-2008 and the Task Force wanted something more near-term. The winter habitat study included some difficult elements and the summer habitat inventory and mapping needed to be better developed. Marcia Armstrong stated that increasingly the Task Force has funded fewer and fewer restoration projects and funding seems to be gravitating away from the Shasta and Scott. John Engbring stated that the Task Force recognizes there has been less funding going toward on-the-ground restoration but there have been other funds coming in from other entities that aren't designed to support sub-basin efforts or monitoring efforts. Marcia Armstrong stated that she is concerned that the Task Force is providing too much support to the production of the megatable.

**Peg Boland called for the question.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**22. Public comment**

Rhonda Muse, SRWC, noted that the RFP that went out to the public did not indicate that priority would be given to near-term projects.

**23. Recap and conclusions**

Next meeting is in Klamath Falls, Oregon, October 19-20, 2005. We need to schedule the February and June meetings in 2006. The Task Force scheduled meetings in 2006. The February 8-9, 2006 meeting will take place in Brookings, OR and the June 21-22, 2006, meeting will take place in Yreka, CA.

**The meeting was adjourned.**

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***

***June 15 - 16, 2005***

***Miner's Inn***

***Yreka, California***

**FINAL AGENDA**

**June 15, 2005**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 9:00 am | 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair. Vice Chair is Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries. Vice Chair for next meeting will be Keith Wilkinson.  |
| 9:10    | 2. Remembrance of Ronnie Pierce   |
| 9:20    | 3. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance   |
| 9:30    | 4. Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Approval of minutes</li><li>b. Adoption of agenda</li></ul>  |
| 9:45    | 5. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Gary Curtis)   |
| 10:00   | 6. Brief Updates and Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Update on State coho recovery process (Neil Manji)</li><li>b. Update on Shasta-Scott Recovery Team (Neil Manji)</li><li>c. Update on NOAA coho recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino)</li><li>d. Update on NOAA hatchery listing policy (Irma Lagomarsino)</li><li>e. Government Accountability Office audit of Restoration Program</li></ul> |
| 10:15   | 7. Discussion of the letter from Sue Ellen Wooldridge regarding additional funding for future monitoring of fisheries in the Klamath Basin (John Engbring)  |
| 10:45   | Break   |
| 11:00   | 8. Discussion of drafting a letter to the Administration regarding the future of the Task Force (John Engbring)   |
| 11:30   | 9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (Neil Manji and Dave Hillemeier) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)</li><li>Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)</li><li>Trinity Management Council (Mike Orcutt)</li></ul>   |
| 12:00   | 10. Public Comment  |
| 12:15   | Lunch   |
| 1:30    | 11. Changes in the 2005 Budget  |



- 2:00 12. Report from the Technical Work Group (Petey Brucker)
- 2:45 13. Report from Budget Committee on proposed 2006 Work Plan
- 3:00 Break
- 3:15 14. Status of Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District and Siskiyou Resource Conservation District Incidental Take Permits (Neil Manji)
- 4:00 15. Planning for Klamath Project Operations and status of the Conservation Implementation Program (Christine Karas, BOR)
- 4:30 16. Public comment
- 4:45 Recess
- 5:00 - 7:00 Field Trip – Meet in the parking lot to caravan to a project site in the Shasta Valley with Dave Webb
- 7:00 - 9:00 pm Social Hour – Join us at Casa Ramos for drinks and dinner

**June 16, 2005**

- 8:00 am 17. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on study results (Nick Hetrick)
- 9:00 18. Report from Klamath Fishery Management Council on the status of Klamath fishery regulations (Curt Melcher)
- 9:30 19. Public comment
- 9:45 Break
- 10:00 20. Reports from Sub-basin Coordinators on the status of sub-basin planning, coordination, and restoration efforts
- a. Salmon River Sub-basin (Jim Villeponteaux, SRRC)
  - b. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP)
  - c. Scott River Sub-basin (Rhonda Muse, SRWC)
  - d. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Will Harling, Karuk Tribe)
  - e. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe)
- 12:00 21. Task Force Decision on 2006 Work Plan
- 1:00 22. Public comment
- 1:15 23. Recap and conclusions. Next meeting is in Klamath Falls, Oregon, October 19-20, 2005. We need to schedule the February and June meetings in 2006.
- Adjourn

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***

***June 15 - 16, 2005***

***Miner's Inn***

***Yreka, California***

**LIST OF HANDOUTS**

Agendum 2	Article from the Times-Standard entitled, "Klamath River Icon Dies", dated Thursday February 17, 2005.
Agendum 5	Letter to John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force from John W. Keys, III, Commissioner, BOR in response of the "Natural Flow Study of the Upper Klamath River", dated May 24, 2005.
Agendum 5	Letter to Secretary Gale Norton from John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Comments on the Draft Report entitled, "Undepleted Natural Flow of the Upper Klamath River", dated March 18, 2005.
Agendum 5	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Charter
Agendum 7	Letter to John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force from Sue Ellen Wooldridge, Office of the Solicitor regarding additional funding for future monitoring of fisheries in the Klamath Basin, dated November 3, 2004.
Agendum 9	Trinity Management Council contact list
Agendum 12	Draft Fiscal Year 2006 Klamath Task Force Ranked Proposals
Agendum 12	Draft Report - Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program 1986-2006
Agendum 13	Recommendation of Budget Committee to Klamath Task Force Funding of Work Plan for 2006
Agendum 15	Schedule of Flow for Klamath River from NOAA Fisheries After Water Year Change from Dry to Below Average, dated June 14, 2005.
Agendum 18	Revised- - Klamath Fisheries Restoration Task Force Draft Resolutions, dated June 16, 2005.
Agendum 20c	Scott River Watershed Council Strategic Action Plan: Immediate-Term (2 year accomplishments – 33 actions), dated June 15, 2005.
Informational	Big Flat Rainfall Data (Inches) 1947-2002 R-Place Ranch, South Fork Smith River, dated June 15, 2005.
Informational	Letter to Curt Melcher, Chair Klamath Fisheries Management Council from Amy Hansen, District Manager, Shasta Valley Resource

Conservation District regarding Harvest Planning for Salmon from the Shasta River fish and near-by portions of the Klamath River, dated March 17, 2005.

Informational

Letter to Amy Hansen, District Manager, Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District from Curt Melcher, Chair, Klamath Fishery Management Council regarding 2005 Klamath River Fall Chinook Fishery Management, dated May 16, 2005.

Informational

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Membership list, dated June 14, 2005.

Informational

Policy Forum – “Synthesizing U.S. River Restoration Efforts”, dated April 29, 2005.

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING******June 15 - 16, 2005******Miner's Inn******Yreka, California*****LIST OF ATTENDEES**

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Yreka, California, on the dates indicated:

**June 15, 2005**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Steve West	West Consulting Group
Jerry Barnes	Klamath Technical Advisory Team
David Leland	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Tam Moore	Capital Press
Jacqui Krizo	Klamath Tribes
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group
Helen Smith	Klamath Tribes
Philip Jackson	Klamath Tribes
Alice Killham	Klamath River Compact Commission
Bobbie Dimonte	NOAA-Yreka
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County
Julie Perrochet	Klamath National Forest
Douglas Parkinson	
Roberta Van de Water	US Forest Service
Adriane Garayalde	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Amy Hansen	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Brian Thomas	Klamath National Forest
David Webb	Shasta CRMP

**June 16, 2005**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County
David Webb	Shasta CRMP
Rhonda Muse	Scott River Watershed Council
Jim Villeponteaux	Salmon River Restoration Council
Adriane Garayalde	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group
Will Harling	Karuk Tribe, Mid-Klamath Watershed Council
Sydney Hoover	Scott River Watershed Council

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***  
***June 15 - 16, 2005***  
***Miner's Inn***  
***Yreka, California***

**MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS**

**Motions:**

**Agendum 4a**

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the February meeting minutes.  
Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.  
Motion passed unanimously.

**Agendum 4b**

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda as amended.  
Seconded by Glen Spain.  
Motion passed unanimously.

**Agendum 21**

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to pass the 2006 fiscal year budget as follows:

- Category 1: 5 Existing sub-basins and PC-01 @ \$30,000;
- Category 2: FP-03, FP-02, FP-06, FP-10, FP-04, FP-09 and FP-08 @ \$13,780, and all projects under TAT/TWG Monitoring;
- Category 3: Status reports by Yreka FWS office;
- \$25,000 from the symposium and Chadwick Consensus meeting are to be applied to FP-09 and FP-08.

Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.  
Peg Boland called for the question.  
Motion passed unanimously.

**Assignments:**

**Agendum 6e**

Staff will determine if Task Force members can review the report from the Government Accountability Office during the review period given to FWS.

**Agendum 8**

Staff will include time for discussion of the Government Accountability Office report on the October agenda, and discussion on letters regarding the future of Klamath Task Force.

**Agendum 9**

Staff will distribute the TMDL presentation to Task Force members.

Staff will include time for an update on the TMDL process on the October agenda.

**Agendum 10**

Staff will contact Klamath County to ask if they plan on appointing a representative to the Task Force.

**Agendum 18**

Glen Spain and Marcia Armstrong will draft a letter to the Secretary regarding the disease issue and planning for emergency situations. They will provide the letter to Staff to distribute to Task Force members for review.

The TWG will work with the Trinity Technical Group to coordinate on fish health issues, and to determine if fall pulse flows on the Trinity are biologically appropriate. The TWG will use the draft resolution as a guiding document. The TWG will report back to the Task Force in October.